

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

FIG. 3A stands objected to because the figure contained two reference numerals "40" and both appear to indicate the annular groove 48. The Replacement Sheet for FIG. 3A, which is attached, shows that the lead line from one of the reference numerals now includes an arrowhead pointing generally to the aperture 40. The other reference numeral "40" has been changed to "48" and refers to the annular groove 48.

FIG. 3A also included two reference numerals "72." The Replacement Sheet for FIG. 3A shows that one "72" is removed from the figure.

FIG. 3A also included two reference numerals "38." The Replacement Sheet for FIG. 3A shows that one "38" has been changed to "36" and its lead line correctly points to the inboard radial wall.

FIG. 13 stands objected to because reference numeral 12 was absent. The Replacement Sheet for FIG. 13 shows that "12" is added to the figure.

FIG. 13 was further objected to because lacks a bearing cup, spacer, retention member, and stake grooves. The Replacement Sheet for FIG. 13 shows in the cross sectioned area the spacer 94, retention member 92, and bearing cup 172 of the replacement bearing assembly 170.

Due to the amendment of the claims, which removes a positive recital of reference grooves and replaces it reference to the stake grooves having been removed for the universal joint, Fig. 13 need not illustrate the stake grooves. The removed stake grooves are illustrated in FIGS. 2, 3A and 3B.

Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are attached to this amendment. No new matter has been added by these amendments to the drawings.

REMARKS

The basis for the objection to the drawings has been overcome as indicated on the Replacement Sheets attached to this amendment, and as discussed above in the Amendments to the Drawings.

The basis for the rejection of Claims 6 and 7 under 37 USC 112, second paragraph, has been overcome, by including reference in Claim 6 to the inboard radial wall and outboard radial wall, which are recited in Claim 1 and from which Claim 6 depends. Claim 7 depends from Claim 6. This amendment clarifies that the same walls are referred to in claims 1, 6 and 7.

Claims 1-3 and 5-7 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Girquis (the '324 patent). The Office action acknowledges that Girquis does not disclose or suggest a plurality of stake grooves in the aperture below the annular groove. The Office action, however, states that the positively recited grooves of the claims do not solve a particular problem. In fact, removal of the stakes presents a problem that the spacer and retaining member solve in combination.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that removal of the stake grooves from the universal joint leaves a space, and the claimed combination includes a spacer that occupies that space following removal of the stake grooves. The stake grooves are no longer recited as a claim element; instead, the stake grooves are recited as a removed or former component, whose absence produces an unwanted space which is filled by the spacer. In this way, the stake grooves cannot be considered equivalent to a scratch, nick or a microscopic imperfection because they were intentionally formed in, and intentionally removed from the universal joint. The space left by the removed stakes is a problem that is solved in the serviced universal joint by locating the spacer in the residual space and the retaining member in the groove. For these reasons the claims patentably distinguish over the prior art patent of Girquis.

Claims 1-3 and 5, and 6 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) is unpatentable over Schultze (the '862 document). The Office action states that the '862 document does not disclose or suggest any stake grooves located anywhere in the device described there.

The '862 document is entirely silent with respect to stake grooves and a spacer. The Office action indicates that element 22 is a spacer; however, components 22 and 122 are balance weights. All of these balance weights are located at the same axial elevation as the plane of the annular groove. They are not located axially inboard from the annular groove. They are fitted axially under each of three holding positions 19 that are arranged around the circumference of the axis 10.

Claim 1 has been amended to distinguish over the disclosure of the '862 document. It recites that the spacer is disposed axially inboard from the annular groove and occupies a space from which stake grooves had been removed because. The balance weights of the '862 document are each located axially coincident with the annular groove. Claim 1 also contains reference to stake grooves having been removed from the universal joint and leaving a space recited claim 1. The '862 document neither discloses nor suggests to stake grooves, removal of such grooves, a residual space, or a spacer located in that space. Yet claim 1 defines the present invention in those terms.

In view of the amendment to the claims and drawings, the bases for the objections and rejections have been overcome. Claims 1-3, 5-7 appear now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank G. McKenzie
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 29,242

MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC
One Maritime Plaza, Fourth Floor
720 Water Street
Toledo, Ohio 43604
(734) 542-0900
(734) 542-9569 (fax)